

REMARKS

The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the Outstanding Action. It is noted with appreciation that claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 are allowed. In response to the indefiniteness rejection to claims 5, 11 and 16, the term "when" has been deleted from the claims and the different embodiments are now the subject matter of separate, dependent claims as suggested by the Examiner. In response to the indefiniteness rejection to claims 2, 8 and 14, the statement "ratios among the filter devices are selectively the same" is amended to read "the predetermined ratio corresponding to one filter device is the same as or different from a ratio of a different device" to illustrate that a ratio in one of the filter devices need not be the same as those in the other filter devices. In an exemplary embodiment with three filter devices, a ratio in the first filter device can be the same as at least one of the other two filter devices, or each of the three ratios can be different from one another. Although the embodiments in the application demonstrate that predetermined area ratios among the filter devices are not the same, they are for illustrative purpose only and do not limit or restrict the scope of the present invention.

CONCLUSIONS

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly accommodated or rendered moot. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is also believed that a full and completed response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

July 29, 2004

By:



Cynthia L. Pillote

U.S. Reg. No. 42,999

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
(602) 382-6296
(602) 382-6070 - Facsimile
cpillote@swlaw.com